

## REMARKS

In the Office Action (final) of May 1, 2007, claims 49, 51-60, 62-71 and 73-81 were rejected. The rejections were maintained in an Advisory Action of August 13, 2007. The claims, as amended, are listed above. Claims 50, 51, 60, 62-71 and 73-81 have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 49, 52-59 are now pending for examination.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and respond to the Office Action as follows:

### Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,987,463 issued to Draaijer at al. ("Draaijer") in view of US Patent No. 6,292,827 B1 issued to Raz ("Raz").

Claims 60, 62-71 and 73-81 have been cancelled, rendering the associated rejections moot. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 60, 62-71 and 73-81 are not patentable over the art cited by Examiner. Claims 60, 62-71 and 73-81 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by Examiner. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue additional claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 60, 62-71 and 73-81, as presented prior to this Amendment in one or more continuing applications.

Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining rejections. In summary, the recited claims require a query sent to a second computer to include data and metadata processed by the second computer, while Raz merely discloses a conventional database system that includes data and metadata locally at the server.

## Present Invention

Independent claim 49, as amended, is directed towards a method for processing a query. The method includes receiving from a first computer system a request to process a query at a second computer system, the request to process the query comprising data and metadata and a request to perform an operation on the data and metadata at the second computer system.

The method also includes processing the query, at the second computer system, including performing the operation on the data and the metadata to generate a result for the query. The data and the metadata are not stored on the second computer system prior to the second computer system receiving the request to process the query. After processing, the second computer system returns the result of the query to the first computer system.

## Prior Art

Draaijer generally discloses accessing foreign processes in a heterogeneous database environment (Abstract). Specifically, Draaijer discloses a client 200 connected via line 310 to a local server process 202 (FIG. 2A). Draaijer explicitly states that metadata definitions for heterogeneous services are stored in the data dictionary 220, in the local process server 202 (8:20-22; also see FIG. 2A). The local process sever 202 includes a SQL services module 210b to parse SQL statements (9:26-32). Examiner acknowledges that Draaijer fails to disclose metadata utilized to process the query that is not stored on a second computer system prior to the second computer system receiving the request to process the query (Advisory Action of 8/13/87). Thus, Draaijer stores metadata on a server.

Raz generally discloses an information transfer network including client terminals and servers with a database system (see Abstract). More particularly, Raz discloses stand alone terminals 1 and home Internet PCs 3 (FIG. 1). Also, Raz discloses servers including a connection manager 10 which is connected to

external systems including content provider systems 11 (FIG. 1; and 4:31-40), as cited by Examiner. In operation, Raz discloses that when an application requires information this is not on the network information database servers 8, the connection manager 10 establishes a connection to the content provider 11 to get the required information. Thus, Raz discloses retrieving content from a remote server.

### Arguments

Draaijer and Raz, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the invention as recited in claim 49. For example, the limitation of claim 49 requires “the query comprising data and metadata and a request to perform an operation on the data and metadata at the second computer system.” Advantageously, the second computer systems need not store data and metadata information. The configuration is highly scalable and can be more reliable when a client computer system has superior reliability over a server computer system. Examples of metadata, as further detailed in claims 58 and 59, include object information such as tables, triggers and indexes. On the other hand, Draaijer merely discloses a conventional database structure in which data and metadata are stored on the server. In fact, Draaijer explicitly states that “a data dictionary 220 providing metadata definitions...is stored in the local database 306” (8:18-20). FIG. 1 also illustrates that the data dictionary 220 is on the server-side of network 2, not on the client-side such as home Internet PC 3. Thus, the data dictionary of Draaijer fails to disclose the query of claim 49.

Moreover, Draaijer teaches away from the limitations of claim 49. A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention (MPEP 2141.02 VI). Specifically, claim 49 requires that “the data and metadata not having been stored on the second computer system prior to the second computer system receiving the request to process the query.” More precisely, claim 49 teaches not storing the data and metadata on the second computer system (e.g., on the

server) while Draaijer teaches storing the metadata on the local process server 202. Thus, Draaijer explicitly teaches away from the second computer system of claim 49.

Raz fails to cure the deficiencies of Draaijer. The SQL statements received by the server in Raz operate in a conventional manner. Raz is silent as to metadata sent from a client to a server for processing on the server. Thus, the SQL statement of Raz fails to disclose the query of claim 49.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 49, as amended is patentable over Draaijer and Raz, either alone or in combination. Likewise, the related dependent claims are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as independent claim 49.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

March 24, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./  
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.  
Reg. No. 30,801

**Customer Number 45728**

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549